FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

Civil Application No. 3418/2007
in
Second Appeal No. 665/2006(decided on 27/4/07)

Appeal Application No. Writ petition	District : of 200

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders.	Court's or Judge's orders

CORAM : Smt. V. A. Naik, J.
DATED : 5th June, 2007.

By this civil application for speaking to minutes, the applicant seeks a minor correction in the order passed by this Court on 27th April, 2007. It is pointed out in the application that this Court, while passing the order dated 27th April, 2007, observed in the order that the sale deed executed by the respondent no.1 in favour of the appellant was not void to the extent of 31 R of land. It is brought to the notice of this Court that the word “void” was incorrectly stated in the order and the correct word is “valid” as has been held by both the Courts.

Though the correction to be made in this order appears to be minor one, it is necessary to correct the word “void” in the order as it would virtually change the complexion of the order.

In view of the aforesaid facts, prayer made in the civil application is granted. The word “void” is hereby directed to be replaced by the word “valid”. The sentence, “Both the trial as well as the appellate Court concurrently held that the sale-deed executed by respondent no.1 herein in favour of the appellant was not void to the extent of 31 R of land, which fell to the share of the plaintiff/respondent no.3” would now be read as, “Both the trial as well as the appellate Court concurrently held that the sale-deed executed by respondent no.1 herein in favour of the appellant was not valid to the extent of 31 R of land, which fell to the share of the plaintiff/ respondent no.3”

Civil application is allowed and disposed of.

JUDGE

RMP